DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 229 EA 014 024

AUTHOR Christner, C. A.
TITLE The J. R. Syndrome: Administrator Bias in Teacher Evaluation. Publication Number 80.51.
INSTITUTION Austin Independent School District, Tex. Office of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17, 1981). Figure 1, Attachments 1-5 may be marginally legible due to small print.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bias; Degrees (Academic); Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Status; *Evaluators; Records (Forms); Sex; Tables (Data); Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Evaluation; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS *Austin Independent School District TX

ABSTRACT

To test for possible biases in school administrators' evaluations of staff members, researchers analyzed all evaluations of teachers and first-year professionals (teachers, librarians, counselors, and others) in the Austin (Texas) Independent School District for the three school years 1977-1980. Variables tested include evaluatee's sex, ethnicity, instructional level, teaching experience, contractual status, and highest degree held, as well as evaluator's sex and ethnic status. Despite nearly annual changes in the evaluation forms, including a switch to competency-based forms, analyses of the ratings revealed similar evaluation trends in all three years. Males, blacks, secondary-level teachers and other professionals, inexperienced teachers, and those with bachelor's degrees and less permanent contracts consistently received lower ratings. Evaluators in different sex or ethnic groups varied from year-to-year in awarding higher ratings. These results indicate the need to consider possible rater biases in the development, implementation, and use of teacher evaluation systems. Appended to the paper are copies of the five different teacher and professional evaluation forms used in the three-year period. (Author/RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED207229

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE J. R. SYNDROME: ADMINISTRATOR BIAS IN TEACHER EVALUATION

A Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association

April, 1981

Author: C. A. Christner, Ph.D.
Office of Research and Evaluation
Austin Independent School District

Publication Number 80.51

Office of Research and Evaluation
Austin Independent School District
Austin, Texas

EA 014 021

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. A. Christner
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

The J.R. Syndrome: Administrator Bias in Teacher Evaluation

C. A. CHRISTNER, Austin (TX) Independent School District

Possible biases may exist in school administrators' evaluations of teachers. Since 1977-78, ratings given teachers on the District's teacher evaluation form have been analyzed across a number of different variables including instructional level and various demographic characteristics of the evaluatee (e.g., sex). Even with implementation of a new competency-based teacher evaluation form in 1978-79, analyses of ratings across these variables generally still revealed the same trends, (e.g., females were rated higher than males). Discussion of the results is presented as is the need to consider these possible rating biases in the development, implementation, or use of a teacher evaluation system.

THE J. R. SYNDROME: ADMINISTRATOR BIAS IN TEACHER EVALUATION

During the 1970's in particular, research and interest in teacher competency has grown a great deal (Borich and Fenton, 1977, and Peterson and Walberg, 1979). It was felt that relevant teacher behaviors (effective ones) could be identified and tied to desired student outcomes (i.e., good achievement test scores). Extensive observational studies and other teacher-effectiveness research at the University level were conducted as well, to try and identify those behaviors which set apart effective teachers from ineffective teachers (i.e., Brophy and Good, 1969; Brophy and Evertson, 1976). Projects dealing with making teacher training and certification more competency-based were implemented. (Soar, Coker, Lorentz, Note 1 and Lorentz, Note 2)

From a different point of view, many school districts wished to assure the highest quality teaching possible. Teacher evaluation was seen as one step toward this goal. The Austin Independent School District (AISD) was no exception. For several years District administrators and teachers worked on committees to develop a new evaluation system. The Board of Trustees did not adopt the system proposed by this committee, but turned the development of a new system over to the Department of Staff Personnel with the technical assistance of the Office of Research and Evaluation. Incorporating the previous committee's work, as well as extant literature reviews, an extensive development process was undertaken.

During the 1977-78 school year, a new competency-based professional personnel evaluation system (to cover teachers, counselors, librarians, special education professionals, etc.) was developed in AISD. The actual development of this system is documented in Christner, Malitz, Kugle, and Calkins, Note 1. When the Board of Trustees approved the system for implementation in the 1978-79 school year, a stipulation was added--that the system be subjected to extensive evaluation during its first year. Based upon this evaluation, decisions were made in terms of continuation and/or changes in the system.

A major part of this evaluation was analyses of the actual ratings given on the evaluation forms. Additionally, the ratings given on the old evaluation forms used in 1977-78 were analyzed to provide baseline comparison data for the new evaluation system. Although the focus of looking at the ratings was to see if they were more realistic (not so uniformly high), it was decided to also look at the ratings across several demographic variables to see if any trends/changes could be discerned.

The trends noted across these demographic variables are the subject of this paper.

METHOD

This paper will discuss analyses of the ratings given on five evaluation instruments currently or formerly in use at AISD. Attachment 1 is the 1977-78 Teacher Evaluation Form; Attachment 2 is the 1978-79 New Professional Checklist; Attachment 3 is the 1978-79 Teacher Evaluation Form; Attachment 4 is the 1979-80 New Professional Checklist; and Attachment 5 is the 1979-80 Teacher Evaluation Form. All five forms are rating checklists with five-point scales (from 5 = outstanding, to 1 = unacceptable/weak). In addition, the forms from 1978-79 on all have rating categories for insufficient information and not applicable. The number of ratings given in these categories is very small and wasn't used in calculation of the mean values discussed here.

The New Professional Checklist is a very brief, general rating scale used to evaluate the performance of professionals (teachers, special education professionals, counselors, and librarians) new to the District. It is completed by the professional's principal or supervisor during the fall of their first year in the District. The Teacher Evaluation Forms are completed each spring on all District teachers who are up for evaluation during the school year. Details of the evaluation process can be found in the AISD Professional Personnel Evaluation Handbook (AISD, 1977).

After the evaluation forms were completed and signed by the principal or supervisor and the evaluatee, the forms were sent to the District's personnel office. The ratings on the forms were keypunched from the forms. The confidentiality of each individual's ratings was maintained at all times. The demographic information obtained on each professional included sex, racial/ethnic background, instructional level, years of teaching experience, contractual status, and highest degree held (coded in 1979-80 only) was obtained from the District's employee master records. The evaluation forms themselves were returned to Personnel. No individual professional's data was made available in any of the summary analysis reported. The data on the sex and racial/ethnic background of the evaluator was coded by hand from each evaluation form, from 1978-79 and 1979-80.

In 1977-78 all professionals up for evaluation were evaluated on the Teacher Evaluation Form. In the new evaluation system implemented in 1978-79, different forms were used for teachers (Teacher Evaluation Form), counselors (Counselor Evaluation Form), special education professionals (Special Education Teacher Evaluation Form) and librarians (Librarian Evaluation Form). In 1979-80, all the above-mentioned forms were revised by reducing the number of competencies on each (i.e., on the Teacher Evaluation Form, the competencies were reduced from 63 to 46). These and other minor revisions were based on analyses of the ratings as well as feedback from District administrators and professionals. In addition, a separate brief evaluation form was created to evaluate those professionals hired during the school year on a temporary basis. Except for the 1977-78 data and the New Professional Checklist data, the breakdowns of the ratings are for teachers only (unless specified otherwise).

RESULTS

Except for differences between ratings given elementary and secondary professionals, which were examined via t-tests, all other analyses performed were analyses of variance with the ratings as the dependent variable and the sex of the evaluator, etc. as the independent variable.

The 1977-78 Teacher Evaluation Form

Figure 1 presents the mean ratings given on the 1977-78 Teacher Evaluation Form broken down by sex of the evaluatee, racial/ethnic background of the evaluatee, teacher type, instructional level, years' experience and contractual status. Means are presented by each of the five competency categories on the 1977-78 Teacher Evaluation Form. All the differences between the subgroups (i.e., male versus female evaluatees) were statistically significant at the .05 level or less.

As can be noted from the figure, all the means are quite high indicating the skew of the ratings given toward the positive end of the rating scale (one of the reasons a new evaluation system was developed).

Female evaluatees received higher ratings (on the average than males across all rating categories.) Across racial/ethnic groups, Black evaluatees generally received higher ratings than did Mexican-American evaluatees. Anglo evaluatees had the highest mean ratings of the three groups.

Among different types of teachers (three categories were defined: regular teachers, special education professionals, and other professionals); the other group had higher mean ratings than did the other two groups (except on Basic Elements of Teaching). This other group consisted of counselors, librarians, school psychologists, etc. Special education professionals received lower ratings than the other professionals, but higher ratings than regular teachers.

Elementary teachers were rated higher, generally, than were secondary teachers. Secondary teachers were rated slightly higher than elementary teachers on Personal Qualities competencies.

Mean ratings varied with the number of years of teaching experience. Teachers with one year of experience generally received lower ratings than those with more experience. Teachers with two years of experience averaged slightly higher ratings than did teachers in the 3 - 5 years of experience group. These differences were almost negligible, and the largest difference in a single category was .04. The 6 - 15 years of experience and 15+ years-of-experience groups received the highest mean ratings.

There were definite differences in ratings given for professionals on different contracts. Temporarily hired professionals had the lowest mean ratings. Among professionals on probationary contracts (1P1 = professional in his/her first year with the District; 1P2 = professional in his/her second year with

the District, 1P3 = professional in his/her third year with the District), progressively higher ratings were received by professionals as they progressed from 1P1 to 1P3 contracts. Professionals on grant contracts (i.e., Title I teachers) received the next highest mean ratings. The professionals on three-year contracts received the highest mean ratings of all the groups.

Although not analyzed statistically, it can be seen from examining Figure 1, that mean ratings in the competency category of Personal Qualities were generally the highest across all groups.

1978-79 New Professional Checklist

Figure 2 presents the mean ratings given by competency category on the 1978-79 New Professional Checklist broken down by sex and racial/ethnic background of the evaluatee. Except in Procedural and Recordkeeping Skills and Expertise in Basic Skills and Subject Areas, males received lower ratings than did females. These differences were statistically significant at the .05 level or less. Across all competency categories, Mexican-American evaluatees received the highest mean ratings, while Blacks received the lowest mean ratings, and Anglo evaluatees were in the middle of the two groups. These differences were statistically significant at the .05 level or less.

A breakdown of the mean ratings given (by competency category) by sex and racial/ethnic background of the evaluator is presented in Figure 3. Except in Interpersonal Skills, male evaluators gave higher ratings than did female evaluators. Except for Interpersonal Skills, these differences were statistically significant at the .05 level or less. In looking at the racial/ethnic background of the evaluator, across all competency categories, Black evaluators gave the lowest mean ratings of the three groups. Except on Procedural and Recordkeeping Skills, Mexican-American evaluators gave the highest ratings with Anglo evaluators in the middle. These differences were statistically significant at the .05 level or less.

Figure 4 presents comparisons across competency categories for differences between ratings given elementary and secondary professionals. In all categories (except Expertise in Basic Skills and Subject Areas) elementary ratings were significantly higher than secondary ratings.

The highest mean ratings across competency categories were in Personal Qualities and Interpersonal Skills.

1978-79 Teacher Evaluation Form

Figure 5 presents the mean ratings given (and N's) across the six competency categories of the 1978-79 Teacher Evaluation Form broken down by sex, racial/ethnic background, level, contractual status, and years of experience of the evaluatee.

Male evaluatees were rated consistently lower than female evaluatees across all competency categories. These differences were statistically significant at the .001 level or less in all cases. In examining the differences in ratings given by racial/ethnic group of evaluatee, analyses of variance revealed statistically significant differences among the groups only in Instructional Skills ($p < .001$), Classroom Management Skills ($p < .028$), Expertise in Basic Skills and Subject Areas ($p < .001$), and Interpersonal Skills ($p < .01$). Generally, Black evaluatees received the lowest ratings, while Mexican-American evaluatees received the highest ratings and Anglo evaluatees received the middlemost ratings (except in Expertise in Basic Skills and Subject Areas where they recieved the highest mean ratings).

There were very definite elementary/secondary differences. Across all six competency categories, elementary teachers had higher mean ratings than did secondary teachers. These differences were all statistically significant ($p < .001$).

In examining differences in ratings by contractual status, one can note certain trends. The temporary teachers received the lowest mean ratings, while those teachers on grant contracts received the highest. 1P1's generally received the next lowest ratings (after temporaries), with 1P2's and 1P3's higher than 1P1's, but showing little differences between them. After grant contract teachers, teachers on a three-year contract received the next highest ratings. Analyses of variance revealed statistically significant differences ($p < .001$) in all six competency categories.

There are also differences in the ratings by years of teaching experience of the evaluatee. Generally, as the number of years of experience increased, the ratings increased, leveling off at 6-15 years of experience. Except for the mean ratings in Personal Qualities (which showed no statistically significant differences among the groups), the other five categories showed statistically significant differences ($p < .04$ or less).

Figure 6 presents the mean ratings by competency category broken down by sex and racial/ethnic background of the evaluator. Generally female evaluators gave higher ratings than did male evaluators. However, these differences were statistically significant ($p < .03$ or less) only for three categories (Procedural and Recordkeeping Skills, Instructional Skills, and Interpersonal Skills).

Mexican-American evaluators were the highest raters across all competency categories. Black and Anglo evaluators overall rated about the same. These differences in ratings were statistically significant across all competency categories ($p < .001$).

Teachers' ratings were not compared statistically with other professionals, since special education professionals, librarians, and counselors now had their own evaluation forms. In comparing the mean ratings given across competency categories (the forms all share many of the same competencies

and categories to a large degree), teachers had generally lower ratings than did special education professionals, who in turn had lower ratings than counselors and librarians.

Also, as can be noted from the figures, the ratings given in the competency categories of Personal Qualities and Interpersonal Skills were generally higher than the other competency areas.

1979-80 New Professional Checklist

Figure 7 presents the mean ratings (broken down by competency categories) by sex and racial/ethnic background of the evaluatees. Although no means within each group were statistically significantly different, certain trends can be noted. Except on Procedural and Recordkeeping Skills and Student/Professional Relationships, males had slightly higher mean ratings than did females. Generally, Black evaluatees had the lowest mean ratings; Anglo evaluatees were in the middle; and Mexican-American evaluatees had the highest mean ratings. The only exceptions were: Anglos had the highest mean ratings on Expertise in Basic Skills and Subject Areas; Anglos had the lowest mean ratings, with Blacks in the middle on Classroom Management Skills; and Blacks had the highest mean ratings on Student/Professional Relationships with Mexican-American evaluatees in the middle.

For the first time comparisons were made by the highest degree held by the new professionals (see Figure 8). Across all six competency categories, those new professionals with Master's degrees had higher ratings than did those professionals with a Bachelor's degree. These differences were statistically significant in three competency categories: Expertise in Basic Skills and Subject Areas ($p < .0002$); Instructional Skills ($p < .04$); and Student/Professional Relationships ($p < .01$).

Figure 9 contains the mean ratings broken down by sex and racial/ethnic background of the evaluator. Male evaluators generally gave higher ratings than did female evaluators, although the differences were statistically significant only in three competency categories (Instructional Skills, $p < .05$; Classroom Management Skills, $p < .01$; and Student/Professional Relationships, $p < .02$). Although no differences were statistically significant in comparing the ratings given by Anglo, Black, and Mexican-American evaluators, general trends were noted. Mexican-American evaluators gave higher ratings than did Anglo evaluators, who in turn gave higher ratings than did Black evaluators.

Mean ratings given at the elementary and secondary levels were compared across competency categories via t-tests. As can be noted from Figure 10, only the ratings given on Procedural and Recordkeeeping Skills and Classroom Management Skills were significantly different--elementary ratings were higher than secondary ratings. Except for the ratings in Expertise in Basic Skills and Subject Areas (where the elementary ratings were slightly lower), the same trend can be noted in the other competency categories.

The competency categories where one can note the highest ratings given, are in Personal Qualities and Student/Professional Relationships.

1979-80 Teacher Evaluation Form

Figure 11 contains the mean ratings given across the six competency categories broken down by sex, racial/ethnic background, highest degree held, contractual status, and years of teaching experience of the evaluatees.

As can be noted, female evaluatees were rated consistently higher than male evaluatees across all competency categories. These differences were statistically significant at the .001 level or less. Except on Student/Teacher Relationships, Anglo evaluatees received higher mean ratings than did Blacks and Mexican-Americans, with Blacks generally receiving the lowest ratings and Mexican-Americans in the middle. Except for Student/Teacher Relationships, these differences were statistically significant at the .04 level or less.

Except on Personal Qualities competencies, Master's degree teachers had higher mean ratings than did teachers with Bachelor's degrees and these differences were statistically significant at the .02 level or less (except for Personal Qualities).

Looking at the differences in ratings given across competency categories by contractual status of the evaluatee, the same trends can be noted across all categories. Teachers employed on grant contracts or those on a three-year contract had the highest ratings, followed by 1P3's, 1P2's, with 1P1's having the lowest ratings. These differences were all statistically significant at the .01 level or less. 1979-80 was the first year in our District that temporarily employed professionals were evaluated on a separate form (Temporary Evaluation Form). Although the form is briefer than the Teacher Evaluation Form, it does contain the same competency categories. Across these categories temporary professionals had lower mean ratings than did those teachers on 1P1 contracts.

As can be noted in Figure 11, across all competency categories, the ratings increased as years of experience increased. There was some leveling off after 6-15 years of experience, with additional years of experience (16+) not necessarily leading to an increase in ratings. All differences were statistically significant at the .01 level or less.

Figure 12 presents the mean ratings given (by competency category) broken down by level. Across all categories, elementary teachers received on the average higher ratings than did secondary teachers. T-tests revealed the differences to be statistically significant at the .0001 level.

The mean ratings given by competency categories are broken down by the sex and racial/ethnic background of the evaluator in Figure 13. Female evaluators overall gave higher ratings than did male evaluators. These differences were statistically significant at the .03 level or less.

Except on Student/Teacher Relationships, Black evaluators gave higher ratings than did Mexican-American evaluators, who in turn gave higher ratings than did Anglo evaluators. These differences were statistically significant at the .04 level or less or approached statistical significance (.06 and .053). On Student/Teacher Relationships, Mexican-American evaluators gave higher ratings than did Black evaluators, while Anglo evaluators gave the lowest ratings. These differences were statistically significant at the .02 level or less.

Although not analyzed statistically, the mean ratings given on the Teacher Evaluation Form were compared with those given on the Special Education, Counselor, and Librarian Evaluation Forms. Teachers had the lowest mean ratings of the groups, with special education professionals having higher mean ratings, and counselors and librarians having the highest mean ratings.

The mean ratings given on Personal Qualities and Student/Teacher Relationships were generally higher than ratings given in the other competency areas.

Summary of the Results

Even across changing evaluation forms and systems, certain trends were noted with relatively few exceptions. Female evaluatees had higher ratings than did male evaluatees. Generally, ratings increased with an increase in teaching experience (leveling off at a certain point). Ratings were lowest for temporarily employed professionals, next lowest for probationary employees, and highest for professionals on three-year or grant contracts. A professional with a Master's degree generally had higher ratings than did a professional with a Bachelor's degree. Although there was some change in Anglo and Mexican-American evaluatees receiving the highest ratings, Blacks generally received the lowest ratings as a group. Counselors and librarians generally received higher ratings than did special education professionals, who in turn had higher ratings than did regular teachers. Elementary teachers and professionals almost always had higher ratings as a group than did their secondary counterparts. There were some shifts in whether male or female evaluators gave higher ratings and whether Anglo, Black, or Mexican-American evaluators gave higher ratings.

Discussion

Being from Texas, it is all too easy to be aware of all the stereotypes which currently abound about Texans. We all have oil wells, wear jeans and Stetsons, drink Lone Star beer, etc. J. R. Ewing in the T.V. series Dallas personifies the stereotype of the Texas villian--he's oil-rich, greedy, two-faced, etc.

Although there may be some degree of truth in stereotypes, a stereotype of a person should not be used as an information source. In evaluating someone especially, the evaluation should be based on gathering as objective information about their performance as is possible.

These analyses done in our district suggest that a competency-based evaluation system is not enough by itself to assure teacher competence. Administrators may bring biases to the evaluation process that preclude the truly objective evaluation of teachers. Our district has conducted many hours of workshops for district administrators on observation techniques, examining lesson plans, and other relatively objective forms of data gathering to feed into the evaluation process. Conferencing with teachers has also been stressed. The data reported seem to indicate this still might not be enough. Are elementary teachers really better than secondary teachers? Are females better teachers than are males? Are counselors more competent than teachers? Do experience and Master's degrees always lead to better teachers? Since several of the teachers in AISD who have gotten in contractual difficulty have had many years of experience, this is certainly not always the case.

Many commendable efforts in trying to define teacher competence and make its measurement objective have occurred and continue to occur around the country and in Canada. Most have been in the context of teacher preparation programs, research on observational systems, or teacher effectiveness. While these are certainly important, defining a good teacher, it seems, is not enough. We need to be sure those who judge the teaching are using precisely the same criteria.

Rater bias seems to be a problem that appears repeatedly in observational studies of teaching effectiveness. As Borich, Malitz, and Kugle (1978) point out, few of the standardized observation instruments have had adequate reliability and validity investigations. Kugel (Note 4) reported that observers may create their own unique ways of classifying teachers' behaviors. If long-term in-depth observational studies have less than perfect reliability, it does not seem surprising that supervisors might let some of their biases or stereotypes enter into the evaluation process.

Clarke (1973) reported observer bias may be a factor in teacher evaluation. Bassin (1974) noted some biases found in college students' evaluations of their instructors. Reavis and Shine (1977) reported graduate students were biased either positively or negatively in their judgments about a teacher's classroom behavior by preliminary remarks they had heard.

Finally, Masters (1977) reported research on perceptions of pedagogic behaviors of women professors by engineering and home economics faculty throughout California. Her results indicate masculinely stereotyped academicians (engineering) perceived the same pedagogic behaviors differently (less effective) than

did femininely stereotyped faculties (home economics). Since teaching, especially at the elementary level, is frequently seen appropriate to the feminine role stereotype, this may explain why women receive higher ratings. It's consonant with their role expectations, so they are expected to be better.

Our data indicate continuing need to focus on trying to make teacher evaluations as unbiased as possible. In our district this means we need to continue to provide evaluation skills training to administrators and provide feedback to them based on the evaluations they conduct. Hickcox (Note 5) expresses concern about the evaluation process and how it is conducted in his district. Although we feel positive about the evaluation process itself in AISD, we are concerned about the divergence with which it is implemented. Administrators vary greatly in their observation and data gathering skills, not to mention conferencing skills. Administrator training programs do little to train administrators to be good personnel evaluators--one of their most important jobs is assuring the highest quality of instruction for students.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Soar, R. S., Coker, H., and Lorentz, J. L. Using process/product relationships as the basis of describing effective teacher behavior. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1977.

2. Lorentz, J. L. The development of measures of teacher effectiveness from multiple measures of student growth. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1977.

3. Christner, C. A., Malitz, D., Kugle, C. L., Calkins, D. S. Competency-based teacher evaluation in a school district: Validation of the competencies' importance by district administrators, professionals, students, and parents. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1979.

4. Kugle, C. L. A potential source of bias in classroom observation systems. Coder drift. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 1978.

5. Hickcox, E. S. Teacher evaluation models and practices. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, 1980.

REFERENCES

Austin Independent School District. AISD professional personnel evaluation handbook. Austin: Austin Independent School District, 1977.

Bassin, W. M. A note on the biases in students' evaluations of instructors. Journal of Experimental Education, 1974, 43, 1, 16-17.

Borich, G. D. and Fenton, K. S. The appraisal of teaching: Concepts and Process. Reading, Ma.: Addison-Wesley, 1977.

Borich, G. D., Malitz, D. and Kugle, C. L. Convergent and discriminant validity of five classroom observation systems: Testing a model. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1978, 70, 119-128.

Brophy, J. E. and Evertson, C. M. Learning from teaching: A developmental perspective. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976.

Brophy, J. E. & Good, T. L. Teacher-child dyadic interaction: A manual for coding classroom behavior. Austin: The Research & Development Center for Teacher Education (Report Series Number 27), 1969.

Clarke, G. E. Merit rating, myth or possibility. National Elementary Principal, 1973, 52, 5, 101-103.

Masters, R. E. Perceptions of women professors' pedagogic behaviors in masculinely and femininely-stereotyped teaching disciplines. ERIC (ED148273), 1977.

Peterson, P. L. and Walberg, H. J., Editors. Research on teaching: Concepts, findings and implications. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1979.

Reavis, C. A. and Shine, S. C. A study of the effects of prefactory remarks on teacher evaluation. ERIC (ED175811), 1977.

		BASIC ELEMENTS OF TEACHING	TEACHING TECHNIQUES	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	PERSONAL QUALITIES	PROF. ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES
SEX	MALE	4.15 (380)	4.04 (373)	4.04 (371)	4.38 (384)	4.18 (383)
	FEMALE	4.25 (1483)	4.22 (1469)	4.21 (1460)	4.42 (1501)	4.25 (1501)
ETHNICITY	MEXICAN-AMERICAN	4.12 (248)	4.10 (245)	4.15 (240)	4.35 (250)	4.13 (250)
	ANGLO	4.25 (1409)	4.22 (1392)	4.18 (1388)	4.43 (1414)	4.25 (1413)
	BLACK	4.14 (197)	4.08 (196)	4.17 (194)	4.38 (199)	4.21 (199)
TEACHER TYPE	REGULAR	4.19 (1508)	4.16 (1506)	4.16 (1501)	4.41 (1509)	4.2[illegible] (1509)
	SPEC. EDUCATION	4.39 (179)	4.28 (177)	4.21 (178)	4.38 (179)	4.2[illegible] (178)
	OTHER	4.38 (167)	4.31 (150)	4.34 (143)	4.44 (175)	4.41 (175)
LEVEL	PRIMARY	4.23 (983)	4.20 (981)	4.23 (978)	4.40 (1001)	4.27 (1000)
	SECONDARY	4.22 (880)	4.17 (861)	4.11 (853)	4.42 (884)	4.21 (884)
YEARS EXPERIENCE	1	4.05 (242)	4.06 (242)	4.07 (239)	4.34 (242)	4.14 (242)
	2	4.23 (215)	4.21 (214)	4.16 (214)	4.44 (216)	4.24 (216)
	3-5	4.21 (367)	4.19 (365)	4.17 (363)	4.40 (367)	4.22 (367)
	6-15	4.44 (470)	4.35 (461)	4.31 (459)	4.51 (473)	4.38 (472)
	16+	4.39 (264)	4.34 (257)	4.34 (255)	4.50 (266)	4.40 (256)
CONTRACTUAL STATUS	3 YR. CONTRACT	4.43 (643)	4.33 (633)	4.32 (627)	4.49 (645)	4.38 (645)
	TEMPORARY	3.75 (82)	3.72 (80)	3.79 (82)	4.21 (82)	3.83 (81)
	GRANT	4.28 (102)	4.24 (99)	4.26 (97)	4.36 (107)	4.32 (107)
	1P1	3.98 (459)	3.98 (458)	4.01 (455)	4.33 (460)	4.07 (460)
	1P2	4.22 (313)	4.20 (313)	4.17 (311)	4.44 (314)	4.25 (314)
	1P3	4.32 (240)	4.30 (235)	4.23 (235)	4.43 (240)	4.28 (240)

Figure 1. MEAN RATINGS ON THE 1977-78 TEACHER EVALUATION FORM. Mean ratings by subgroups and rating categories with N's.

COMPETENCY CATEGORIES	Sex		Racial Background		
	Male	Female	Black	M-A	Anglo
Personal Qualities	3.38 N=103	3.48 N=383	3.27 N=45	3.65 N=77	3.44 N=360
Procedural and Record-Keeping Skills	3.42 N=103	3.25 N=183	3.09 N=43	3.17 N=75	3.16 N=353
Instructional Skills	3.11 N=100	3.26 N=381	3.07 N=43	3.25 N=75	3.23 N=358
Classroom Management Skills	3.15 N=102	3.33 N=380	3.05 N=44	3.47 N=77	3.29 N=357
Expertise in Basic Skills & Subject Areas	3.31 N=100	3.23 N=379	3.05 N=44	3.26 N=77	3.25 N=353
Interpersonal Skills	3.31 N=101	3.38 N=371	3.25 N=40	3.50 N=76	3.34 N=355

Figure 2. MEAN RATINGS GIVEN ON THE COMPETENCY CATEGORIES ON THE 1978-79 NEW PROFESSIONAL CHECKLIST BY SEX AND RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF THE EVALUATEE.

COMPETENCY CATEGORIES	Sex		Racial Background		
	Male	Female	Black	M-A	Anglo
Personal Qualities	3.48 N=334	3.41 N=149	3.12 N=67	3.61 N=87	3.49 N=328
Procedural and Record-Keeping Skills	3.18 N=325	3.11 N=147	3.02 N=67	3.16 N=84	3.19 N=320
Instructional Skills	3.24 N=329	3.18 N=148	3.03 N=66	3.37 N=85	3.22 N=325
Classroom Management Skills	3.32 N=331	3.22 N=148	2.99 N=67	3.40 N=87	3.33 N=324
Expertise in Basic Skills & Subject Areas	3.27 N=327	3.16 N=148	3.02 N=66	3.32 N=87	3.26 N=321
Interpersonal Skills	3.36 N=329	3.37 N=143	3.11 N=65	3.56 N=86	3.36 N=320

Figure 3. MEAN RATINGS GIVEN ON THE COMPETENCY CATEGORIES ON THE 1978-79 NEW PROFESSIONAL CHECKLIST BY SEX AND RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF THE EVALUATOR.

COMPETENCY CATEGORIES	Elementary Means	Secondary Means	t Value	p
Personal Qualities	3.53	3.33	3.86	(.000)
Procedural and Record-Keeping Skills	3.35	3.16	2.24	(.025)
Instructional Skills	3.28	3.12	2.71	(.007)
Classroom Management Skills	3.36	3.18	2.67	(.008)
Expertise in Basic Skills & Subject Areas	3.24	3.25	-.22	N.S.
Interpersonal Skills	3.42	3.30	1.91	(.058)

Figure 4. ELEMENTARY/SECONDARY RATING DIFFERENCES COMPARED VIA T-TESTS FOR THE 1978-79 NEW PROFESSIONAL CHECKLIST.

		PERSONAL QUALITIES	PROCEDURAL & RECORD-KEEPING SKILLS	INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SKILLS	EXPERTISE IN BASIC SKILLS & SUBJECT AREA	INTERPERSONAL SKILLS
SEX	MALE	3.58 (323)	3.33 (323)	3.36 (319)	3.55 (186)	3.55 (321)	3.55 (322)
	FEMALE	3.75 (1207)	3.58 (1207)	3.64 (1207)	3.72 (218)	3.73 (1207)	3.81 (1207)
ETHNICITY	BLACK	3.64 (187)	3.51 (187)	3.45 (186)	3.55 (186)	3.53 (186)	3.70 (187)
	MEXICAN-AMER.	3.76 (219)	3.55 (219)	3.61 (217)	3.72 (218)	3.65 (219)	3.86 (219)
	ANGLO	3.72 (1136)	3.52 (1136)	3.60 (1135)	3.66 (1134)	3.72 (1135)	3.74 (1135)
LEVEL	ELEMENTARY	3.85 (863)	3.68 (852)	3.73 (850)	3.82 (860)	3.81 (851)	3.95 (852)
	SECONDARY	3.53 (666)	3.31 (665)	3.38 (663)	3.43 (665)	3.52 (664)	3.49 (664)
CONTRACT STATUS	3 YR.	3.78 (441)	3.65 (441)	3.67 (441)	3.77 (440)	3.82 (441)	3.84 (441)
	T	3.45 (69)	3.16 (69)	3.31 (68)	3.29 (69)	3.39 (69)	3.41 (69)
	GRANT	3.93 (106)	3.87 (106)	3.92 (106)	3.96 (106)	3.98 (106)	4.08 (106)
	1P1	3.61 (378)	3.36 (378)	3.39 (376)	3.47 (376)	3.51 (376)	3.59 (377)
	1P2	3.75 (286)	3.52 (286)	3.61 (286)	3.69 (286)	3.68 (286)	3.81 (286)
	1P3	3.75 (194)	3.52 (194)	3.65 (193)	3.71 (193)	3.72 (194)	3.81 (194)
	NEAR RETIREMENT	3.49 (56)	3.49 (56)	3.48 (56)	3.52 (56)	3.59 (56)	3.60 (56)
YEARS EXP.	1	3.68 (195)	3.44 (195)	3.52 (195)	3.60 (195)	3.57 (195)	3.71 (195)
	2	3.72 (191)	3.47 (191)	3.61 (191)	3.67 (191)	3.68 (191)	3.77 (191)
	3-5	3.76 (322)	3.56 (322)	3.65 (321)	3.72 (321)	3.73 (322)	3.80 (322)
	6-15	3.79 (403)	3.65 (403)	3.70 (402)	3.78 (401)	3.84 (402)	3.87 (403)
	16 +	3.78 (175)	3.70 (175)	3.66 (175)	3.75 (175)	3.86 (175)	3.80 (175)

Figure 5. MEAN RATINGS AND N'S ACROSS THE SIX COMPETENCY CATEGORIES OF THE 1978-79 TEACHER EVALUATION FORM BROKEN DOWN BY SEX, ETHNICITY, ELEMENTARY/SECONDARY, CONTRACTUAL STATUS, AND YEARS' EXPERIENCE OF THE EVALUATEE.

		PERSONAL QUALITIES	PROCEDURAL & RECORDKEEPING SKILLS	INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SKILLS	EXPERTISE IN BASIC SKILLS & SUBJECT AREAS	INTERPERSONAL SKILLS
EVALUATOR SEX	MALE	3.71 (1191)	3.50 (1191)	3.57 (1187)	3.64 (1187)	3.67 (1189)	3.73 (1190)
	FEMALE	3.76 (350)	3.61 (350)	3.64 (350)	3.71 (350)	3.74 (350)	3.85 (350)
EVALUATOR RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND	BLACK	3.74 (198)	3.51 (198)	3.55 (198)	3.62 (198)	3.67 (198)	3.70 (198)
	M.A.	3.91 (279)	3.68 (279)	3.76 (278)	3.83 (278)	3.84 (279)	4.01 (279)
	ANGL.	3.66 (1064)	3.49 (1064)	3.54 (1061)	3.62 (1061)	3.65 (1062)	3.70 (1063)

Note: The N's reflect number of forms rated, not number of male or female evaluators, etc.

Figure 6. MEAN RATINGS ACROSS THE SIX COMPETENCY CATEGORIES OF THE 1978-79 TEACHER EVALUATION FORM BROKEN DOWN BY EVALUATOR VARIABLES.

COMPETENCY CATEGORIES	MALE (N=80)	FEMALE (N=381)	BLACK (N=25)	MEX.-AMER. (N=88)	ANGLO (N=347)
PERSONAL QUALITIES	3.68	3.62	3.56	3.75	3.61
PROCEDURAL AND REC-ORDKEEPING SKILLS	3.12	3.20	3.04	3.21	3.19
EXPERTISE IN BASIC SKILLS AND SUBJECT AREAS	3.35	3.30	3.12	3.25	3.34
INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS	3.31	3.29	3.20	3.34	3.29
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SKILLS	3.37	3.34	3.40	3.45	3.31
STUDENT/PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS	3.45	3.47	3.56	3.55	3.44

Figure 7. MEAN RATINGS GIVEN ON THE COMPETENCY CATEGORIES ON THE 1979-80 NEW PROFESSIONAL CHECKLIST BY SEX AND RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF THE EVALUATEE. The differences between/among each of the groups are not statistically significant.

COMPETENCY CATEGORIES	BACH. (N=343)	MASTERS (N=117)
PERSONAL QUALITIES	3.60	3.71
PROCEDURAL AND RECORDKEEPING SKILLS	3.17	3.21
EXPERTISE IN BASIC SKILLS AND SUBJECT AREAS	3.25	3.48 (significant at .0002)
INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS	3.26	3.40 (significant at .04)
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SKILLS	3.32	3.41
STUDENT/PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS.	3.43	3.59 (significant at .01)

Figure 8. MEAN RATINGS GIVEN ON THE 1979-80 NEW PROFESSIONAL CHECKLIST BROKEN DOWN BY DEGREE LEVEL OF THE NEW PROFESSIONAL BY COMPETENCY CATEGORY. Only for the items indicated, were the differences between the groups statistically significant.

COMPETENCY CATEGORIES	MALE (N=324)	FEMALE (N=137)	BLACK (N=53)	MEX.-AMER. (N=84)	ANGLO (N=324
PERSONAL QUALITIES	3.65	3.57	3.51	3.67	3.64
PROCEDURAL AND RECORDKEEPING SKILLS	3.20	3.14	3.06	3.22	3.20
EXPERTISE IN BASIC SKILLS AND SUBJECT AREAS	3.34	3.23	3.25	3.35	3.31
INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS	3.33 (significant at .05)	3.20	3.17	3.34	3.30
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SKILLS	3.40 (significant at .01)	3.22	3.24	3.45	3.34
STUDENT/PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS	3.51 (significant at .02)	3.37	3.38	3.63	3.44

Figure 9. MEAN RATINGS GIVEN ON THE 1979-80 NEW PROFESSIONAL CHECKLIST BROKEN DOWN BY SEX AND RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF THE EVALUATOR. Only for the items indicated, were the differences between the groups statistically significant.

COMPETENCY CATEGORIES	ELEMENTARY (N = 266) MEANS	SECONDARY (N = 165) MEANS	t VALUE	PROBABILITY
PERSONAL QUALITIES	3.64	3.56	1.25	.214
PROCEDURAL AND RECORDKEEPING SKILLS	3.30	3.13	2.36	.019
EXPERTISE IN BASIC SKILLS AND SUBJECT AREAS	3.28	3.30	-.40	.693
INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS	3.33	3.22	1.34	.183
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SKILLS	3.38	3.08	3.12	.002
STUDENT/PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS	3.45	3.44	.09	.925

Figure 10. ELEMENTARY/SECONDARY RATING DIFFERENCES ON THE 1979-80 NEW PROFESSIONAL CHECKLIST COMPARED BY t-TESTS.

		PERSONAL QUALITIES	PROCEDURAL & RECORDKEEPING SKILLS	EXPERTISE IN BASIC SKILLS & SUBJECT AREAS	INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SKILLS	STUDENT/ TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS
SEX	MALE	3.71 (329)	3.37 (328)	3.58 (328)	3.44 (327)	3.58 (327)	3.69 (328)
	FEMALE	3.87 (1267)	3.57 (1267)	3.78 (1267)	3.67 (1266)	3.79 (1267)	3.89 (1267)
ETHNICITY	BLACK	3.75 (174)	3.44 (174)	3.60 (173)	3.51 (172)	3.66 (173)	3.84 (174)
	MEXICAN AMERICAN	3.83 (243)	3.46 (243)	3.62 (243)	3.55 (243)	3.69 (243)	3.89 (243) *
	ANGLO	3.86 (1174)	3.56 (1173)	3.78 (1174)	3.66 (1173)	3.77 (1173)	3.84 (1173)
DEGREE	BACHELOR'S	3.82 (1170)	3.51 (1170)	3.70 (1170)	3.59 (1169)	3.72 (1169)	3.83 (1169)
	MASTER'S	3.89 (423)*	3.61 (422)	3.85 (422)	3.74 (421)	3.83 (422)	3.91 (423)
CONTRACT STATUS	1P1	3.66 (350)	3.31 (350)	3.48 (350)	3.39 (350)	3.53 (349)	3.63 (349)
	1P2	3.83 (313)	3.46 (312)	3.68 (312)	3.58 (312)	3.72 (312)	3.83 (313)
	1P3	3.91 (253)	3.58 (253)	3.80 (253)	3.70 (252)	3.81 (253)	3.93 (253)
	1	3.94 (531)	3.71 (531)	3.93 (531)	3.78 (530)	3.90 (531)	3.98 (531)
	GRANT	3.94 (69)	3.71 (69)	3.84 (69)	3.81 (69)	3.84 (69)	3.95 (69)
YEARS OF EXPERIENCE	1 YEAR OR LESS	3.73 (425)	3.32 (425)	3.50 (425)	3.41 (425)	3.55 (424)	3.69 (424)
	2 YEARS	3.80 (184)	3.44 (184)	3.66 (184)	3.58 (184)	3.69 (184)	3.80 (184)
	3 - 5 YEARS	3.87 (322)	3.58 (322)	3.77 (322)	3.67 (321)	3.82 (322)	3.90 (322)
	6 - 15 YEARS	3.91 (467)	3.65 (467)	3.88 (467)	3.74 (467)	3.85 (467)	3.93 (467)
	16 + YEARS	3.91 (198)	3.70 (197)	3.94 (197)	3.76 (196)	3.86 (197)	3.96 (198)

Figure 11. MEAN RATINGS AND N'S ON THE SIX COMPETENCY CATEGORIES OF THE 1979-80 TEACHER EVALUATION FORM BROKEN DOWN BY SEX, ETHNICITY, DEGREE, CONTRACT STATUS, AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE EVALUATEE. Unless indicated otherwise, these differences were statistically significant at the .05 level or less. * = nonsignificant.

COMPETENCY CATEGORIES	ELEMENTARY (N=882) MEANS	SECONDARY (N=709) MEANS	t VALUE	PROBABILITY
PERSONAL QUALITIES	3.94	3.71	9.06	.0001
PROCEDURAL AND RECORDKEEPING SKILLS	3.60	3.45	5.50	.0001
EXPERTISE IN BASIC SKILLS AND SUBJECT AREAS	3.80	3.66	5.14	.0001
INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS	3.72	3.50	8.10	.0001
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SKILLS	3.85	3.61	8.57	.0001
STUDENT/TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS	3.98	3.69	10.60	.0001

Figure 12, ELEMENTARY/SECONDARY RATING DIFFERENCES ON THE 1979-80 TEACHER EVALUATION FORM COMPARED BY t-TESTS.

		PERSONAL QUALITIES	PROCEDURAL & RECORDKEEPING SKILLS	EXPERTISE IN BASIC SKILLS & SUBJ. AREAS	INSTRUCTION SKILLS	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SKILLS	STUDENT/ TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS
SEX OF EVALUATOR	MALE	3.81 (1149)	3.51 (1148)	3.72 (1148)	3.59 (1148)	3.72 (1147)	3.81 (1148)
	FEMALE	3.92 (435)	3.58 (435)	3.79 (435)	3.70 (433)	3.82 (435)	3.96 (435)
ETHNICITY OF EVALUATOR	BLACK	3.92 (207)	3.62 (207)	3.88 (207)	3.71 (207)	3.81 (207)	3.87 (207)
	MEX AMER	3.88 (290)	3.52 (290)	3.71 (290)	3.63 (290)	3.78 (290)	3.93 (290)
	ANGLO	3.81 (1088)	3.52 (1087) .06	3.72 (1087)	3.61 (1085)	3.72 (1086) .053	3.82 (1087)

The number of N's reflect the number of evaluations conducted, not the number of male oe female evaluators,etc.

Figure 13. MEAN RATINGS AND N'S ON THE SIX COMPETENCY CATEGORIES OF THE 1979-80 TEACHER EVALUATION FORM BROKEN DOWN BY SEX AND ETHNICITY OF THE EVALUATOR. Except where indicated all differences were statistically significant at the .05 level or less.

P-5231

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

TEACHER EVALUATION FOR YEAR 19..... to 19.....

NAME _____ GRADE or SUBJECT _____ SCHOOL _____

Present Contractual Status (Circle One) 3 2 1 1P1 1P2 1P3 P1 1R T G

DIRECTIONS: The following statements describe the *teacher* who achieves success. For each statement place a check mark in the column which is your best estimate of the degree of success that the teacher has achieved.	Outstanding	Strong	Average	Minimally Acceptable	Weak
A. BASIC ELEMENTS OF TEACHING					
1. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT MATTER—Has knowledge of and broad background in subject matter taught; is well-informed concerning the latest developments in his field, and is reasonably well-informed in fields related to his specialty.					
2. CONSIDERATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL—Encourages and inspires each pupil to work to his capacity; provides opportunity for each pupil to gain recognition in developing a desirable status with his peer group.					
3. INTERPRETATION OF PUPIL GROWTH—Interprets pupil's emotional, scholastic and social progress to parents and pupils with sympathy, understanding and accuracy; demonstrates the knowledge and ability to test, interpret and use results effectively; class records are complete, accurate and easily understood.					
B. TEACHING TECHNIQUES					
1. LESSON PLANS—Provides consistently for effective class, group, and individual needs through preparation of written lesson plans which include a variety of materials and techniques; makes allowance for flexibility to meet changing situations.					
2. PRESENTATION—Creatively presents subject matter which embraces the needs, abilities, and interests of pupils; uses a wide variety of special materials and resources consistently in an effective manner.					
3. ASSIGNMENTS—Makes challenging, clear, flexible, and appropriate assignments so that each pupil knows what is expected of him in order to achieve the desired goals.					
4. USE OF RESOURCES AND MATERIALS—Provides for effective teaching by careful organization and use of materials, by frequent teacher-pupil evaluation, by alertness to new methods, by use of constructive suggestions, and by enrichment of content in his own area.					
5. COMMUNICATION—Consistently uses effective oral and written expression by practicing correct grammar and vocabulary suited to the pupil; uses a well-modulated pleasant voice.					
6. RESULTS—Shows evidence of continuous scholastic development of all pupils through the use of effective experiences and study habits; inspires pupils to develop and strengthen their ethical and cultural values.					
C. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT					
1. DISCIPLINE—Is cordial, fair, impartial, and consistent in the relationship with pupils; maintains good class control in an atmosphere conducive to good learning; demonstrates and capitalizes on a sense of humor.					
2. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT— Consistently gives careful attention to the physical condition and appearance of the classroom; encourages and instructs the pupils in handling supplies and equipment efficiently and economically.					
D. PERSONAL QUALITIES					
1. PHYSICAL FITNESS—Is physically fit; exhibits vitality and energy sufficient to carry a maximum teaching load as well as full share of extra-curricular responsibilities.					
2. EMOTIONAL STABILITY—Has poise and a wholesome sense of humor; is emotionally stable and exhibits selfcontrol.					
3. RELATIONS WITH OTHERS—Is understanding, tactful and open-minded, exhibits good judgment; displays empathy, kindness and cultural awareness; accepts criticism or recognition gracefully; shows adaptability.					
4. CHARACTER TRAITS—Exemplifies personal integrity which reflects high moral standards and refinement; shows enthusiasm for work, evidences creative ability and perseverance; is loyal, consistant and sincere.					
5. APPEARANCE—Maintains an attractive appearance by dressing appropriately and in good taste; remains well-groomed, and displays good posture and poise.					
6. DEPENDABILITY—Is alert, punctual and accurate; shows initiative, imagination, and resourcefulness; displays common sense.					
E. PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES					
1. PROFESSIONAL ETHICS—Thoroughly understands practices and promotes acceptance of standards of professional conduct consistant with the "Texas Teachers' Code of Ethics," placing emphasis on the following areas: pride in profession and encouragement of respect for it; tact in speaking of his school and colleagues, employs proper channels for interpretation of, or request for, changes in administrative policies.					
2. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH—Constantly seeks to grow professionally through such activities as travel, use of professional literature and in-service training; consults resource personnel; shares successful efforts with others.					

Attachment 1. 1977-78 TEACHER EVALUATION FORM (page 1 of 2).

© COPYRIGHT
Austin Independent School District

DIRECTIONS: The following statements describe the *teacher* who achieves success. For each statement place a check mark in the column which is your best estimate of the degree of success that the teacher has achieved.	Outstanding	Strong	Average	Minimally Acceptable	Weak
3. ATTITUDE TOWARD ADMINISTRATION—Recognizes the necessity of administrative policies and procedures, assists with the formulation, loyally supports them and complies with them; cooperates in accepting responsibility and activities.					
4. LOCAL SCHOOL RESPONSIBILITIES—Consistently promotes friendly relationships through active participation in faculty groups; meets school responsibilities including extra-curricular activities in a punctual forthright manner and with a spirit of cooperation.					
5. UNDERSTANDING OF TOTAL SCHOOL PROGRAM—Consistently works cooperatively with all grades or subject areas and realizes that each is a necessary and integral part and has its own contribution to make to the overall school program.					

GENERAL EVALUATION STATEMENT (Summary statement concerning overall competency, including statements as to unusual strengths and/or weakness.)

I have read this evaluation and after a conference with my immediate supervisor concerning it, I have received a copy of the completed evaluation instrument.

_____
Signature of Teacher

PRINCIPAL'S RECOMMENDATION

1. To second year probation _____
2. To third year probation _____
3. To three year contract _____
4. To one year contract (approaching retirement) _____
5. Return to one year probation _____
6. Change from supply to contractual status _____
7. Resigning _____
8. Should not be reemployed _____
9. Should be reemployed if funding permits _____

Signed _____ Date _____

Attachment 1. (continued, page 2 of 2.)

© COPYRIGHT
Austin Independent School District 27

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

NEW PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL EVALUATION OCTOBER 19____

NAME _____ GRADE or SUBJECT _____ SCHOOL _____

DIRECTIONS: The new professional's performance is evaluated according to the following major criteria. Indicators for each criterion are provided to serve as a guide for evaluation by evaluators and by the professional. Based on performance information, the evaluator estimates the professional's effectiveness in meeting each of the evaluation criterion as follows: X = insufficient information, 5 = outstanding, 4 = strong, 3 = good/expected, 2 = minimally acceptable, 1 = unacceptable, 0 = not applicable.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	Insufficient information	outstanding	strong	good/expected	minimally acceptable	unacceptable	not applicable	SUPPORTING COMMENTS OR DATA
I. PERSONAL QUALITIES--is physically and emotionally fit, character traits exemplify integrity, is dependable.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
II. PROCEDURAL AND RECORD KEEPING SKILLS--recognizes and supports administrative policies and procedures.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
III. INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS--prepares and uses instructional methods which enable each student to achieve instructional objectives.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
IV. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SKILLS--establishes and maintains an environment conducive to student learning.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
V. EXPERTISE IN BASIC SKILLS AND SUBJECT AREAS--demonstrates knowledge and good practice of basic essentials of mathematics and standard English, has broad background in subject area taught.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
VI. INTERPERSONAL SKILLS--establishes relationships with colleagues, students, and parents which reflect recognition of and respect for every individual.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
VII. COUNSELORS--provides information of services available, provides counseling for students, works with principals and teachers.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
VIII. LIBRARIANS--maintains an adequate library and audio-visual unit, informs teachers of available materials.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
IX. SPECIAL SERVICES TEAM MEMBERS--evaluates student plans and progress regularly, is familiar with local resources and programs, uses appropriate diagnostic assessment procedures.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	

Evaluator statement of evaluatee strengths:

Signature of evaluator _____ date

Evaluator statement of what evaluatee needs to improve:

I have read this evaluation and had a conference with my immediate supervisor concerning it. I have received a copy of the completed evaluation instrument.

Signature of evaluatee _____ date

© COPYRIGHT Austin Independent School District

Attachment 2. 1978-79 NEW PROFESSIONAL CHECKLIST.

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

TEACHER EVALUATION FOR YEAR 19_____ TO 19_____

NAME _____ GRADE or SUBJECT _____ SCHOOL _____

PRESENT CONTRACTUAL STATUS (circle one) 3 2 1 1P1 1P2 1P3 1P4 P1 T G 1R RR1

DIRECTIONS: The following statements describe the teacher who achieves success. Based on performance information, the evaluator estimates the teacher's effectiveness in meeting each of the criteria. Circle the number or letter which most nearly describes the teacher's attainment of the criterion. After having reviewed the ratings, the evaluatee may place a check in the final column if there is disagreement.

		insufficient information	outstanding	strong	good/expected	minimally acceptable	unacceptable	not applicable	disagrees
I. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES	A. PERSONAL QUALITIES								
	1. Is physically capable of performing assigned tasks.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	2. Is emotionally stable.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	3. Exhibits poise and self-control.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	4. Presents an effective role model.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	5. Is punctual.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	6. Behaves rationally and realistically.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	7. Shows initiative and imagination.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	8. Uses common sense.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	9. Shows enthusiasm for work.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	10. Communicates effectively and pleasantly.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	11. Exhibits an overall positive attitude.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	12. Demonstrates professional growth.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	B. PROCEDURAL AND RECORD-KEEPING SKILLS								
	1. Keeps school records and reports up-to-date and accurate.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	2. Recognizes the necessity for and complies with all administrative policies and procedures.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	3. Complies with all school board policies and procedures.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	4. Complies with local campus routines.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	5. Documents student progress effectively.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
II. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS	A. INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS								
	1. Prepares written lesson plans whose instructional objectives are evident to students and self.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	2. Employs creative and imaginative approaches to teaching.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	3. Designs lessons which incorporate a variety of materials, instructional techniques, and learning activities.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	4. Presents subject matter appropriate to the needs, abilities, and interests of students.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	5. Makes clear to students standards for learning performance.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	6. Diagnoses individual and class difficulties.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	7. Moves around the room at times, rather than teaching seated behind the desk.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	8. Plans instruction around needed student competencies.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	9. Prepares appropriate tests and evaluation activities to measure student learning.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	10. Reports test and evaluation data competently to parents.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	11. Uses formal and informal means for assessing student learning.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	12. Designs lessons and units with clear, logical and sequential content.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	

© COPYRIGHT Austin Independent School District

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS	13. Utilizes a variety of questioning strategies.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	14. Interprets own tests and evaluation activities accurately.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	15. Paces instruction to suit students' concentration and interest spans.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	16. Makes assignments appropriate to the student's instructional level.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	B. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SKILLS							
	1. Uses a variety of motivational strategies.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	2. Maintains class control in an atmosphere conducive to learning.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	3. Organizes the class routine so that little time is lost in transition from one learning activity to another.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	4. Organizes the classroom for quick and efficient distribution of learning materials.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	5. Has a lesson plan for the day so that each student moves smoothly through the day's learning activities.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	6. Uses management procedures which prevent behavior problems from arising.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	7. Uses behavior management techniques which preserve student and teacher dignity and self-esteem if problems arise.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	8. Practices positive reinforcement techniques.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	9. Allocates time to include presentation of all appropriate content.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	10. Provides enrichment activities for students who complete assigned work.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	11. Involves all students in learning activities.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	12. Is prepared to begin teaching at the beginning of each period.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	C. EXPERTISE IN BASIC SKILLS AND SUBJECT AREAS							
	1. Has knowledge and a broad background in subjects taught.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	2. Is well informed concerning latest developments in content fields.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	3. Demonstrates knowledge and ability to use the basic essentials of standard English in oral and written communication and in spelling.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	4. Demonstrates knowledge and ability to use the basic essentials of mathematics skills and concepts.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	5. Presents information verbally in a clear and understandable fashion.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	6. Teaches lessons and units that reflect the AISD curricula.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
III. INTERPERSONAL SKILLS	III. INTERPERSONAL SKILLS							
	1. Fosters positive self-images in students.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	2. Fosters students' self-control and self-direction.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	3. Is consistent in relationships with students.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	4. Is cordial in relationships with students.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	5. Treats students impartially.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	6. Is adaptable when dealing with individual and cultural differences.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	7. Communicates with students sympathetically, accurately and with understanding.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	8. Works effectively with teachers, student teachers and support personnel.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	9. Recognizes and responds to contributions of students.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	10. Respects students' rights and encourages their sense of responsibility.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	11. Establishes a warm relationship with students.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0
	12. Communicates with parents sympathetically, accurately and with understanding.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0

© COPYRIGHT
Austin Independent School District

EVALUATEE COMMENTS--Summary statement of disagreement with any of the competency ratings.

I have read this evaluation and after a conference with my immediate supervisor concerning it, I have received a copy of the completed evaluation instrument.

Signature of Evaluatee _____ Date _____

EVALUATOR'S GENERAL EVALUATION STATEMENT--Summary statement concerning overall competency, including statements as to unusual strengths and/or weaknesses.

EVALUATOR RECOMMENDATION OF WHAT EVALUATEE NEEDS TO DO TO IMPROVE:

EVALUATOR'S RECOMMENDATION

1. To second year probation _____
2. To third year probation _____
3. To fourth year probation _____
4. To three year contract _____
5. To one year or two year contract (approaching age 65) _____
6. To one year contract (after age 65) _____
7. Return to one year probation _____
8. Change from temporary to contractual status _____
9. Reciring _____
10. Resigning _____
11. Should not be reemployed _____
12. Should be reemployed on Grant status if funding permits _____

Signature of Evaluator _____ Date _____

© COPYRIGHT Austin Independent School District

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

NEW PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL EVALUATION FORM

19 ☐☐

Last Name ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

First Name ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

M.I. ☐

Social Security Number ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

Grade or Subject _____

School/Location _____

School Code ☐☐☐

Directions:

The new professional's performance is evaluated according to the following major criteria. Indicators for each criterion are provided to serve as a guide for evaluators and for professionals. For categories I through VI, please refer to the Behavior Descriptors for more detail. Complete VII, VIII, and IX for the appropriate groups only. Based on performance information, the evaluator rates the professional's effectiveness in achieving the criteria as follows: X = Insufficient Information, 5 = Outstanding, 4 = Strong, 3 = Good/Expected, 2 = Minimally Acceptable, 1 = Unacceptable, and 0 = Not Applicable.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	Insufficient Information	Outstanding	Strong	Good/Expected	Minimally Acceptable	Unacceptable	Not Applicable	SUPPORTING COMMENTS OR DATA
I. **PERSONAL QUALITIES**—is an effective role model; behaves realistically; is enthusiastic and positive; is personally capable.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
II. **PROCEDURAL AND RECORDKEEPING SKILLS**—complies with all policies and procedures; is an effective, accurate, and timely recordkeeper.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
III. **EXPERTISE IN BASIC SKILLS AND SUBJECT AREAS**—uses the basic elements of standard English; is knowledgeable and has a broad background in subject(s) taught; professional duties, i.e., counseling, library science.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
IV. **INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS**—diagnoses students' needs; plans around students' needs; presents clear, logical, and creative lessons; conducts appropriate evaluation activities.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
V. **CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SKILLS**—organizes instructional time effectively; involves and motivates students; practices positive reinforcement techniques; maintains class control in an atmosphere conducive to learning.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
VI. **STUDENT/PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS**—fosters positive self-images, self-control, and self-direction in students; is consistent, adaptable, and impartial; respects students' rights and encourages their sense of responsibility.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
VII. **COUNSELORS**—counsels students; provides accurate and realistic information to students; works constructively with staff.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
VIII. **LIBRARIANS**—selects appropriate library resources; follows *AISD Guide to Library and Media Services*; encourages and instructs students and staff in library resources usage.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
IX. **SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONALS**—uses appropriate diagnostic and assessment procedures; is familiar with local resources and programs; develops and evaluates individual educational plans; coordinates services with regular school program.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	

Evaluator's statement of Evaluatee's strengths:

Evaluator's statement of what Evaluatee needs to do to improve:

Number of formal observations by building administrator/unit supervisor _____

_____ _____

Signature of Evaluator Date

I have read this evaluation and have had a conference with my immediate supervisor concerning it. I have received a copy of the completed evaluation instrument.

_____ _____

Signature of Evaluatee Date

© COPYRIGHT
Austin Independent School District

Attachment 4. 1979-80 NEW PROFESSIONAL CHECKLIST.

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

19 ☐☐

Last Name ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ First Name ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ M.I. ☐

Social Security Number ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

Grade or Subject _____

School/Location _____ School Code ☐☐☐

Circle the appropriate status below:

PRESENT CONTRACT STATUS—PROBATIONARY/TERM: 1P1 1P2 1P3 1P4 P1 3 2 1 1R 2R

PRESENT EVALUATION STATUS—GRANT CONTRACT: 1G1 1G2 1G3 3GT 2GT 1GT 1GR 2GR

Directions:
The following statements describe the teacher who achieves success. Based on performance information, the evaluator estimates the teacher's effectiveness in meeting each of the criteria. Circle the number or letter which most nearly describes the teacher's attainment of the criterion. After having reviewed the ratings, the evaluatee may place a check in the final column if there is a disagreement.

COMPETENCIES	Insufficient Information	Outstanding	Strong	Good Experienced	Minimally Acceptable	Unacceptable	Not Applicable	Disagree
I. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES								
A. Personal Qualities								
1. Is punctual.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
2. Is physically capable of performing assigned tasks.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
3. Exhibits poise and self-control.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
4. Presents an effective role model.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
5. Uses common sense; behaves realistically.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
6. Shows enthusiasm for work.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
7. Exhibits an overall positive attitude.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
8. Demonstrates professional growth.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
9. Works effectively with teachers, students, teachers, and support personnel.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
B. Procedural and Recordkeeping Skills								
1. Complies with all policies and procedures.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
2. Keeps school records and reports up-to-date and accurate.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
3. Documents student progress effectively.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
II. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS								
A. Expertise in Basic Skills and Subject Area								
1. Uses the basic essentials of standard English in oral and written communications and in spelling.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
2. Uses the basic essentials of mathematics skills and concepts.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
3. Has knowledge and broad background in subjects taught.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
4. Presents information verbally in a clear and understandable fashion.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
5. Teaches lessons and units that reflect the AISD curricula.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
B. Instructional Skills								
1. Diagnoses individual and class differences.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
2. Plans continuous growth needed student competencies.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
3. Designs lessons incorporating a variety of materials, instructional techniques, and learning activities.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
4. Designs lessons and units with clear, logical, and sequential concepts.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
5. Prepares written lesson plans with instructional objectives which are evident to students and self.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	

COMPETENCIES	Insufficient Information	Outstanding	Strong	Good Experienced	Minimally Acceptable	Unacceptable	Not Applicable	Disagree
B. Instructional Skills (Cont.)								
6. Makes clear to students standards for learning performance.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
7. Presents subject matter appropriate to the needs, abilities, and interests of students.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
8. Employs creative and imaginative approaches to teaching.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
9. Utilizes a variety of questioning strategies.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
10. Prepares appropriate test and evaluation activities to measure student learning.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
11. Interprets own tests and evaluation activities accurately.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
12. Reports test and evaluation data competently to parents.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
C. Classroom Management Skills								
1. Maintains class control in an atmosphere conducive to learning.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
2. Is prepared to begin teaching at the beginning of each class period.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
3. Organizes class routines so little time is lost in transition from one learning activity to another.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
4. Allocates time to include presentation of all appropriate content.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
5. Practices positive reinforcement techniques.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
6. Uses a variety of motivational strategies.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
7. Involves all students in learning activities.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
8. Provides enrichment activities for all students who complete assigned work.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
III. STUDENT/TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS								
1. Fosters positive self-images in students.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
2. Fosters students' self-control and self-direction.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
3. Is consistent in relationships with students.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
4. Treats students impartially.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
5. Is empathetic in dealing with individual and cultural differences.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
6. Communicates with students accurately, empathetically, and with understanding.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
7. Recognizes and responds to contributions of students.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
8. Respects students' rights and encourages their sense of responsibility.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
9. Moves around the room to facilitate individual learning.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	

Page 1 of 2

© COPYRIGHT
Austin Independent School District

Attachment 5. 1979-80 TEACHER EVALUATION FORM. (Page 1 of 2.)

EVALUATOR'S GENERAL EVALUATION STATEMENT—Summary statement concerning overall competency, including statements as to unusual strengths and/or weaknesses.

EVALUATOR'S RECOMMENDATION OF WHAT EVALUATEE NEEDS TO DO TO IMPROVE:

EVALUATEE'S COMMENTS—Summary statement of disagreement with any of the competency ratings.

I have read this evaluation, and after a conference with my immediate supervisor concerning it, I have received a copy of the completed evaluation instrument.

Signature of Evaluatee _____ Date _____

EVALUATOR'S RECOMMENDATION ON CONTRACT STATUS:

1. To second year probation. —
2. To third year probation. —
3. To fourth year probation. —
4. To three year contract. —
5. To one year or two year contract (approaching age 70). —
6. Return to one year probation. —
7. Change from temporary to contractual status. —
8. Retiring. —
9. Resigning. —
10. Should not be reemployed. —
11. Should be reemployed on Grant status, if funding permits. —

Signature of Evaluator _____ Date _____

© COPYRIGHT

Austin Independent School District

Attachment 5. 1979-80 TEACHER EVALUATION FORM. (Page 2 of 2.)